

ANTIDOTES AGAINST SOME

infectious passages in a Tract,
concerning Schisme.



LONDON,

Printed for Thomas Underhill at the signe of the Bible
in Woodstreet, 1642.

Antidotes against some infectious passages in a Tract, concerning Schisme.

Pag. 5. Toward
the end: per spi-
rited persons.

IT is a great pleasure, and advantage to the *Socinians*, to lessen the estimation of the judgement of the Fathers, that so their mighty works against *Arrians*, and others of kin to *Socinians*, may have lesse credit and trust; But certainly his Argument doth not follow, That because they have failed in some lesser points, therefore their judgment is not competent in greater: This Argument being set against *Barnabas*, and *Paul* would have shewed an ill face: Because *Barnabas* and *Paul* did not agree in the small Controversie of taking *Marke* with them, they were incompetent Judges of greater Controversies of Faith. It is a wise Dispensation of *Divine Providence*, That in this life wee know but in part, and it is a great preservation of Humility, that it is so. Our blindnesse in lesser matters shewes whence wee have our Light in greater, and calls upon us to give the Glory of our Light to the Father of Lights: Again, this knits us the faster in a spirituall Commerce, while one man knowing but in part, hath need of anothers help, who knows that part, which to himself was unknowne. If this Authour know more concerning the Controversie of *Easter*, surely I believe the Fathers knew more then hee (before hee had read them) of the great Controversies of the *Trinity*, And certainly if the mighty Arguments taken out of the heart of Scripture, by *Athanasius*, *Cyrill of Alexandria*, and others, against those Heresies, which are now revived by *Socinians*, be duly

duly weighed, it must be acknowledged that the Spirit of Truth was powerfull in them, and that they had the very minde of Christ: And so at worst, they were but like the Church of *Thyatira*, which the Spirit commends for *Faith*, and works, though with all the same Spirit saith, *I have a few things against thee.* Revel 2.

Pag. 7. *Towards the end.* } This passage hath need of
What if the gesture or adora- } Salt, to make it savoury. If
tion be used to the Altars? } there be an idolatrous ado-
 ration to Altars in one place, and none in another, I think it is no *Schisme* to forbear that place, where this abominable wickednesse is committed, which both offends God, and vexeth the souls of righteous *Lots*: and to goe to another, where neither God, nor man is so offended. And it is considerable, whether thy voluntary, and indifferent using such places doe not encourage such Idolaters in their Idolatry, yea, give some hint to a weak brother to think that it is approved by thee. Saint *Pauls* reason against eating things sacrificed to Idols, seems to lead us to such an opinion. Neither doth this example of the *Israelites* coming to *Shiloh*, (where were the corrupt manners of *Elies* sons) agree with this case: For there was a necessity at that time to repaire to that place, it being settled, and peculiarly appointed for a great part of Gods worship, which could not elsewhere be performed.

Deut. 12. 5, 11,
13, 14.

1 Sam. 1. 3.

Pag. 9. *Indeed Mani-* } It seemes that the buyers of
chaisme, Valentinianisme, } this Authour inclines more to
Macedonianisme, &c. } *Arrianisme* than to *Macedonia-*
nisme, Manichaisme, &c. And certainly, if *Socinians* may

be Judges, they will finde reasons, why *Arrianisme* shall be accounted but a *Schisme*, and the others Heresies: But indifferent Judges will perchance find such to be Judges of partiall thoughts, and that not upright ballances, but speciall favours are used in this partiality. For is it not a favour to undertake, that *Valentinus*, *Manes*, *Macedonius* did know their Errours to be lies, and *Arrius* did not? Again, though there be such a difference in these heads and roots of Errours (which I think this Author can hardly make good out of any acquaintance with their hearts) yet if he had carried an equall affection to each side, hee might with equall favour have excused their followers, upon whom the names by him expressed (*Arrianisme*, *Valentinianisme*, *Mahometisme*, &c.) are fixed: For though the first Authors of these Sects might differ, yet no question many of their followers were alike, and equall, that in simplicity of heart, and out of ignorance, not wilfulnesse, did embrace their Errours. Neither did these know, that the opinions, which they received, were lies. Yea, even at this day *Mahometans* generally doe not think, that the Doctrine of *Mahomet*, which they believe, is a Lie: being seriously, and extremely zealous in it.

Deum verum
& cum patre,
unum Deum no-
lunt fateri, Au-
gust. cont. sect.
Arianorum.
Hi dicunt
Nos creaturam
quidem illum
esse dicimus, &c.
Epiph. H. r. 49.
Psal. 18.

Secondly, is it not an high favour to affirme, that the Rents in the Church for the opinions of *Arrius*, and *Nestorius* were at worst but *Schismes*, and that upon matter of opinion? For is it meerly matter of opinion (wherein is a safe freedom to opine one way or another) to believe, or not believe that Christ Jesus is not true God, but a creature? Doth not this looke like a matter of salvation, or damnation, and not meerly of opinion? Can that faith, which believes not Christ to be God, n

us into him, who is God? And can wee be carried into union with him, further then our faith goes before and apprehends him? If our faith doe not believe him to be true God, our union will not be with him as true God, & being not united to him, as he is God, we can have no salvation from him. Christ as hee is God is that Rock, on which the Church being built hath safety and salvation, and in him is that saying of *David* verified. *Who is a Rock but God alone?* Again, if there be a reall dis-union between such a Misbeliever, and Christ; Is there not a reall dis-union betweene such a Misbeliever, and the Members of Christ? Hee that is not in union with the Head, hath no union with the members, and this dis-union is not meerly in matter of opinion, but in deed, and Truth.

Thirdly, it seemes a very scandalous favour allowed to *Arrians* to frame *Liturgies*, for their sakes, that we, and they might joyn in one *Liturgie* and one Congregation.

For is not this in effect to say, That in all our *Liturgie* wee must not say, *Christ is very God of very God?* nor call him, that which hee is, nor pray to him as God? yea, may we read those Chapters, wherein hee is said to be *God blessed for ever*, or, *This is the true God, and life eternall?* Far be it from us in the least Atome to abate the Godhead of Christ, or the Glory, and worship due to that Godhead: to joyne with unbelieving men, that diminish both his Godhead, and his Glory. If they have not unity with us in the Head, I know no reason, why in the name, or for the sake of that Head, wee may, or should have Communion with them. It is Christ (God with us) that unites Christians, who believe in that God Christ: And if men are not united to him, and in him (through

Rom. 9.5.
1 John 5.20

1 Tim 3. 16.

(through the faith which is in him, as God manifest in the flesh) there is a true disunion both betweene Christ, and them, and between them and true Christian. And where there is such a Dis-union, and likewise a Dis-union in the very object of worship, how can they fitly joyn in one worship, who do not worship, one, and the same God?

Fourthly, it seems a favour to the *Arrians*, to save them from the title of Heresie, which is the ancient terme deservedly fastned to them. Hee cannot but know that misbelief in fundamentall points was anciently accounted Heresie, and it was profitably done to put this misbeliefe under a fearfull name, it being destructive to salvation, that men might shun and avoid it. To this end were the Rules and Summes of Faith commonly used, and carried about, that men might take the contrary beliefs to be Heresies: So *Optatus*, *Hæretici veritatis exules, sani & verissimi Symboli desertores*. And *Tertullian* long before him. *Hæc Regula [Fidei] a Christo ut probabitur instituta, nullas habet apud nos quæstiones, nisi quas hæretici inferant aut hæreticos faciant*. And if this Authour will needs have the name of Heresie taken away from these misbeliefs, yet he cannot thereby take away the killing nature of them: So are they still mortall, like Heresies, by what name soever they be called. Indeed the wilfull holding of lesse and extrafundamentall Errours may be deadly, but not from the nature of the points, whereon the Errour is fixed, but by reason of the pravity of the will, which affects a Lye, and hath not in it, the love of the truth. But Saint *Augustine* being a true believer in the greater points, and not loving Errour in the lesser (much lesse in the greater) might well say, I may erre, but I will not be an Heretick. why

Opt. lib. 1.

Tertull. de pro-
ser cap. 14.

Pag. 10. *Why may?* Surely a *Socinian* may easily
I not goe to an Arrian thinke that hee may goe to an *Ar-*
Church? *rian* Church, but orthodox Chri-
 stians have accounted it an abomination: Let us bring
 forth one example, instead of many, not unknowne to
 this Authour. When *Alexander* the Bishop of *Constanti-*
nople should be enforced to admit *Arrius* into his Com-
 munion by *Eusebius* a favourite Bishop of the Court, he
 fled to sighes, teares, and prayers, desiring of God, that
 he would take him out of this life, that he might not be
 polluted with the contagion of *Arrius* (a man reproach-
 full against God) or that God would shew some strange
 work; This Prayer shortly obtained his request: For
Arrius going aside to a place of Retreat, brake in sunder
 like *Judas*, and in that unclean place ended his life.] So
Epiphanius Their prayers and their persons are an abo-
 mination to that God the Father, who is not well plea-
 sed with any prayers or persons, that are not presented
 to him in the name of God the Sonne. And surely if a
 loose belief in Christ, and such as doth not reach home
 to his Godhead may be a ground of Communion, why
 may not this Authour joyne in Communion with the
Mahometians? whose *Alcoran* tels them, that Christ was a
 good man, though not God, which is not much short of
 the *Arrians*.

*Epiph. Tom. 2.
 advers. Her.
 Her. 48. sine 68.*

Pag. 10. *Private?* To call the difference between us
fancies upon which we and the *Arrians* private fancies, is an
differ. Untrue, and scandalous expression.
 The Scripture I am sure, is neither of private inspirati-
 on, nor fancy, but men of God spake it as they were in-
 spired with that universall Spirit, which breatheth into
 the

1 John 5.20.

the Catholike Church. For the same Spirit, which animateth the Church, inspired the Prophets and Apostles. Now the Scripture saith of Christ, *This is very God*: So indeed to deny Christ to be true God is a private fancie of *Arrins* and *Socinus*, but to confesse him to be true God, and to pray unto him as such, is a Catholike verity. Wherefore let every true and Catholike Christian say unto Christ with converted, and believing *Thomas*. *My Lord, and my God*.

John 20.28.

AMEN.



THE
P O E T S
RE C A N T A T I O N,

having suffered in
the *Pillory*. the 2.

of *April* 1642.

With a penitent submis-
sion of all things, that have
beene written against the
King and State.

In an humble Petitionary descrip-
tion, obsequiously commended to the
Honorable and High Court of
PARLIAMENT.

I O H N B O N D.

Scribitur, & scriptus consumitur igne Libellus.

London Printed for *T. A.* and *Ioseph Wren*. 1642.